Introduction

This third volume of the Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics covers a diversity of topics which range from general linguistic theory to child language. To provide coherency, we have, therefore, grouped the papers into a number of major sections as reflected in the Table of Contents. What follows is our attempt to capture the major point of each paper, organized according to those sections.

The first paper is Ken Miner's "On the Notion "Restricted Linguistic Theory": Toward Error-Free Data in Linguistics." Miner maintains that linguistic theories must be more firmly grounded on secure data bases. He contends that the attempt to construct theories based on limited data from a few languages leads to serious errors. Rather than seeking to construct general theories, Miner advocates that we should limit ourselves to "restricted theories" which may be confined to one language family.

The Phonetics-Phonology section contains four very different papers. Geoff Gathercole's research demonstrates that instrumental evidence can play a crucial role in phonological analysis. His instrumental research on strong and weak stops in Kansas Potawatomi clearly indicates that the underlying contrast between these series is preserved even in final positions, not neutralized as heretofore supposed. In addition, the paper provides evidence for the interaction between stress and the syntactic structure of Potawatomi.

Mahmut Yavaş' paper on the implications of borrowing for Turkish phonology provides a modus operandi for the analysis of languages which have lexicons replete with loan words. In the case of Turkish, previous analyses, though recognizing the importance of loan words, have neglected to incorporate them into their descriptions. Drawing evidence from borrowing, Yavaş proposes that current treatments of vowel and consonant harmony should be drastically revised: consonant harmony plays the pivotal role in determining the vowel choice, NOT Conversely. By so analyzing Turkish, he is able to account for a wide range of data unaccounted for by treatments which assume the primacy of vowel harmony.

Robert Rankin's study of Quapaw as a dying language supports the evidence from child language acquisition, aphasia, and comparative linguistics that there exists a universal hierarchy of sound-type complexity. As Quapaw functioning less and less as a native language, principled changes occurred in its phonology: the types of series lost and the order in which they were lost were determined by their relative complexity, with the most marked being lost first.

Code-mixing is the topic of Maria Dobózy's paper. Taking a letter written by a bilingual American-Hungarian as her data, Dobózy describes the phonological rules that are operating in such a code-mixing, with special emphasis on vowel harmony. She demonstrates that vowel harmony is an important process in the system and plays a central role in the rendition of English words by such speakers.

The first paper in the Syntax-Semantics section is Gerald Denning's, "Meaning and Placemen dit of Spanish Adjectives." Denning attempts to clarify the problems of the differences in the meaning and treatment
of restrictive adjectives in three dialects of Spanish. He argues that a strict generative semantic approach will not handle the data and suggests an analysis within the framework of pragmatics.

Gathercole's study provides a cross-linguistic study of the use of the deictic verb "come" and "go." She focuses on the use of "come" and "go" in eleven languages by extending Talmy's (1975) model for verbs of motion to include a presuppositional component. Gathercole divides the contexts in which "come" and "go" are used into (a) immediate deictics and (b) extended deictics. Her goal is to characterize the use of deictic verbs of motion in the eleven languages studied by a limited number of dispositional and presuppositional components and thus suggest a possible universal framework for such verbs.

Whereas Denning and Gathercole focus on language related issues, Juan Angels Arasatg'as takes a more general, philosophical approach in his discussion of speech acts. He claims that previous speech act analyses used the sentence as the basic unit. Angels Arasatg'as believes, however, that we must go beyond the sentence: "Social reality" dictates that we categorize sets of sentences into speech acts, which he calls "complex acts."

Kurt Godel's paper, "Problems in Machine Translation Between Thai and English Using Montague Grammar," brings us to a specific language oriented concern: how to mechanically translate sentences, in particular those containing restrictive relative clauses, from one language to the other. He enumerates the problems related to such a task and proposes a solution involving meaning postulates and context within a Montague framework.

Historical and Comparative Linguistics is represented by Karen Booker's "On the Origin of Number Marking in Muskogean." Booker reconstructs two proto-Muskogean number markers, one pluralizer and one pluralizer which were first used with intransitive verbs of location and then generalized to locative transitive verbs. Later these markers spread to intransitive non-locatives. Booker maintains that the highly complex suppletive verb system of Muskogean arose when these markers lost their original meaning.

Three papers, Esther (Ett) Dromi's analysis of the acquisition of locative prepositions by Hebrew children, Gregory Simpson's study of children's categorization processes, and John More's review of relative clause research, constitute the Child Language Acquisition section of the working papers. Dromi's study, which is one of the few published works in the acquisition of Hebrew, compares the order of acquisition of Hebrew locatives with Brown's (1973) order for English and also with Stolin's (1973) universals. Among her findings, Hebrew at "(out)" is acquired later than English on. Her findings for Hebrew locatives are particularly interesting in that they allow a comparison of the acquisition of prepositions with that of full prepositions. Her conclusions point to the pivotal role that morphological complexity plays in the order of acquisition of locatives in Hebrew.

Gregory Simpson's major concern has to do with the process by which children form conceptual categories. He argues, on the basis of experimental data, that overextensions should not be taken as evidence
for category formation. His data suggest a distinction between concept formation and object naming, a distinction not made in previous studies. "Function," what objects can do or what can be done to them, determines how that object is conceptualized, but an object's perceptual properties may determine the name given to it. Therefore, "the child may know that two objects don't really belong together, but gives them the same name until he has more evidence."

The acquisition of relative clauses has been a topic of great interest among psycholinguists. John Macraf presents a valuable critical review of the recent literature with special emphasis on the debate between Dan Slobin (1971), Amy Sheldon (1974), Michael Smith (1975), Tavakolian (1977), and de Villiers et al. (1976). The Minimal Distance Principle, the Noun-Verb-Noun Strategy, the Parallel Function Hypothesis, and Slobin's operating principles are compared, along with the formulations of de Villiers and Tavakolian.

Five major topic areas are represented in this third volume of the Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics. Each paper in its own way is a contribution to linguistic scholarship: some provide evidence in new areas of inquiry, others bring new evidence to bear on old questions, while still others suggest future courses of research.

Anthony Stalano and Feryal Yavaş
Editors
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Introduction

Joyce Friedman is currently doing research on Montague grammar and she is writing, along with co-researchers, computer programs that can parse English sentences, translate these parsetrees into LISP analogues of intensional logic, translate these LISP expressions back into English parsetrees, and interpret or assign meanings to these LISP expressions by reference to a machine model analogous to Montague's possible worlds, time points, and entities. Assuming the success of Friedman's programs, it should be possible then to use them to translate one natural language into another if one has Montague-based grammars for similar fragments of both languages and the appropriate computer programs.

In this paper, I would like to discuss some of the problems that such a translation would have to solve. Two genetically unrelated languages, English and Thai, will be used for the examples for several reasons. First, using unrelated languages, one would expect to meet more difficult problems due to different syntactic constructions than if related languages were used. Therefore, if a machine translation is shown to be possible for unrelated languages, then there should be a greater range of application since it should be a somewhat easier task to do the same for closely related languages. Second, certain constructions in English and Thai are similar enough to illustrate the relative ease with which a Montague theory can handle the translation. Third, these same constructions are at the same time different enough in certain respects to present difficult problems which, if adequately treated by the theory, reveal the theory's power and utility. Such a syntactic construction in the two languages is the restrictive relative clause (RC). While many of the syntactic RC types are extremely similar in terms of word order and rule operation, and the semantic representations in both languages serve to identify uniquely the referent of the head noun, different kinds of relative clauses in one language may be the same kind of RC in the other or else a relative clause of one type in one language must be expressed as an RC of a different type in the other language. These differences are problems not only for the syntax of a Montague grammar, but also for the semantic component.

In the following sections I describe the kinds of RCs in the two languages, how a Montague-type grammar describes them, and then I discuss specific problems that a machine would encounter in translating RCs.
Brief Comparison of English and Thai Relative Clauses

In Godden (1978), I extend Montague's (1974) rules to account for sentences like those in (1).

1 a. the boy went to the market
b. the book he writes
c. the house where you live
d. the boy whose father is tall
e. the girl who hit the boy who looked at her

Let us look at the corresponding Thai sentences when we try to translate (1), preserving the same relative clause types.

2 a. คื้น พูด ที่มัน ไป ตลาด
c. บ้าน ที่คุณ อยู่
d. คื้น พูด ที่มัน ไป ตลาด

Note first the similarities of the syntactic forms between Thai and English. In both languages, the first noun in the embedded sentence that is co-referential to the head noun is replaced by a relative pronoun which is moved to the beginning of the embedded sentence. Where the embedded noun is the subject, this movement takes place vacuously. It can be seen that the basic form and functioning of the syntactic rules for Thai will be the same as those for English. Since the semantic rules in Montague grammar change each syntactic operation into a semantic form, the semantic representations for the most part would also be the same for both languages.

Problems in Translating Relative Clauses

One obvious difference between the Thai and English RC's is in the choice of relative pronouns. While English has several, Thai has only one. This presents no problems as far as the English relative pronouns whom, which, and that are concerned since they are entirely syntactic in nature; that is, the choice of one or the other depends only on grammatical relations.
mational gender. There is no semantic difference in the intensional logic
expression. However, looking at the relative clauses of place expressed
with where in English, we encounter difficulties.

For English, the relative pronoun where is introduced by an adver-
bial variable, whereas who(whom), which, and that are from noun phrase var-
iables. Therefore, for where, the semantics is different from the others.
In Thai, if we had only one relative pronoun, there would be no differ-
ence in its semantics between reference to places and reference to
things. If a machine were to translate from Thai to English then, the
Thai expression for the house where you live could come out in English as *the house which you live*. The problem is revealed even more clearly
in (3) and (4).

3. ร่อนที่คุณคิดว่าจะซื้อ

4. ร่อนที่คุณคิดว่าจะซื้อ

4 a. The trench that you dug

b. The trench where you dug

Either of (4a) or (4b) is a possible translation of (3). In (4a) we
could have a situation where the speaker is saying that someone dug
a trench and that trench is long. (4b) could describe a very different
situation where a trench was already dug (by anyone or anything) and
someone was inside that trench digging something, perhaps another
smaller trench, and that larger trench is long. Both that and where
RC’s serve to limit the reference of the noun from a set of many
possible objects to one specific object. However, as (3) and (4) show,
the actual state of the world can be quite different between the two
types of RC’s. In translating (3) to English, if this is translated al-
ways as a noun phrase, there is no way to represent the meaning of (4b)
and therefore no way to derive (4b).

The obvious solution is to regard this as one of two homophonous,
but syntactically and semantically disjoint, relative pronouns. One
this would correspond to English who(whom), which, and that and the other
this to where. This would assure the correct translation from English
to Thai. This analysis of this is required not only to translate it
into English, but it is necessary for any descriptive grammar of Thai
in order to represent the two different meanings of this in intensional
logic.

A far more difficult problem to solve is revealed in (5a) and (5b).
Thai has no construction analogous to English possessive RC’s. (5a)
would have to be translated as (5b).

5. ด้านหน้าของที่คุณไม่พอสูง

child male

that have rather be-tall

the boy who has a tall father

(5) is still an RC, but of a very different type and one that expresses
a different embedded proposition. Of course, when interpreted semanti-
cally (5a) and (5b) would refer to the same individual, but how can the
translation be done with a machine that was intensional logic, not its
interpretation, as the level of mediation between the two languages?
Notice that the problem only arises when translating from English to
Thai. When translating (5) into English the machine would simply pro-
duce the English gloss given for (5). However, for (5a) we have an in-
tensional logic expression that is roughly shown in (6).^6

6. \[ \chi \in (\text{boy}(x_n) \land \text{his}(x_n) \land \text{father}(x_n) \land \text{be-tall}(x_n)) \]

There is no RC construction in Thai that could give this expression. Therefore, our machine could not give us a Thai translation using RCs.

One solution, which is quite undesirable, would be to write another computer program that would take us from the interpretation model into expressions of Intensional logic. Such a program would have to take representations of entities, worlds, and time points and produce intensional logic expressions which could be regarded as true or false and which represent relationships among the entities, worlds, and times. This would include building expressions of relationships that do not exist.

In short, a program like this could produce as output an indefinite number of expressions representing any number of real or hypothetical relationships. Restricting a program like this would be virtually an impossible task.

A different approach to the problem would be to take (6) and derive any Thai expression with an equivalent meaning. If our goal is to convey in one language what was expressed in another, then why restrict ourselves to the same syntactic constructions in this translation?

Taking this approach, we see that (6) represents a conjunction. Thus, we could take the English sentence John is the boy whose father is tall, come to a logical expression which contains (6), then arrive at a conjunction in Thai,

\[ \text{coon pen ček phudaj iā pho khoŋ khaw suŋ John be child male and father poss. be-tall} \]

John is the boy and his father is tall.

For this example, it appears that we can do this. However, this is merely an accident. If (6) is used as the subject of the verb instead of the object, the anomaly reveals itself.

7. The boy whose father is tall likes Mary,

8. ček phudaj iā pho khoŋ khaw suŋ čoa marči child female and father poss. be-tall like Mary

The boy and his father is tall likes Mary.

If (7) were allowed to be translated into (8), an ungrammatical sentence would result. The reason is because in Montague’s intensional logic common nouns are represented as predicates. In (6), boy\( '(x)\) is an open sentence. However, if it could be converted to English \( '(\text{boy})\) it cannot. It would be expressed as a common noun, which happens to be conjoined to a sentence. But natural languages cannot conjoin common nouns and sentences. This is guaranteed by Schachter’s (1976) Coordinate Constituent Constraint.

How, then, could our machine translate English possessive RC’s into Thai? This answer can be found within Montague’s theory itself. Montague lists nine “meaning postulates” which restrict the possible interpretations of intensional logic to those natural for English. One of these meaning postulates assures “the natural definition of seek as try to find,” (p.264). This meaning postulate states that x’s seeking some-
thing is logically equivalent to x's trying to find something. We can allow for a similar meaning postulate to solve our problem. This meaning postulate will simply state that our interpretations (for either language) are restricted to those in which an expression x has an ab (where x and b are entities and a is an attribute) is logically equivalent to an expression x's b is a. In this way, we can take (1a) and (1b) into an intensional logic expression containing (5). Then since (6) contains an expression of the form x's b is a, viz. his' ('father') ('be-tall'), where his' refers to boy('x'), our meaning postulate will allow the machine to change this to the logically equivalent form x has an ab, roughly 'boy('x')'x('have('tall('father'))'). This last expression is then converted easily to (5), the desired result.

Non-RC-Highlighted Problems

The section above discussed problems related specifically to translating RC's for Thai and English. In the course of the discussion, the reader may have noticed some other possible difficulties our task would have to meet. For example, consider (2b). Here we can see a problem that arises naturally out of the fact that English is more of an inflecting language than Thai.

In translating a Thai sentence to English, how does our machine know what tense to use in the English sentence and what number to associate with the subject and verb? The Thai RC in (2b) can have its embedded sentence express either the present or the past tense, and its head noun either singular or plural. Of course, this depends on the context and results in no ambiguity for native speakers who have access to this context. It follows then that our machine must also have access to the context in order to translate correctly.

In Oh and Godden (1978), a new theory of grammar is presented which associates a linguistic expression with two things. The first is its "basic" meaning, its intensional logic form in a Montague theory; and the second is a set of contexts in which the linguistic expression may be used. A context is viewed as a set of propositions which must be interpreted just as the "basic" proposition of the sentence. Applying this to our present problem, Friedman's program that converts sentence parsing into logical forms would be modified to change parsing into logical forms with associated contexts. In translating Thai to English, the user of the system would supply the Thai sentence along with tense and number specified in the accompanying context. The other program that converts logical expressions to natural language would also have to be modified to take two inputs, the converted logical expression and the context, also in the form of intensional logic expressions.

It may appear superficially that inputting the system with a sentence and also with tense and number is an ad hoc solution. However, the tense and number are just part of what may be many other statements, in particular prepositions and deictic categories, which naturally account for and explain a wide range of phenomena concerning language use and meaning.

One more point should be mentioned about (1) and (2). Comparing (1a) and (2a), we see that the English contains a proposition which has
no counterpart in Thai. Since this preposition has a reflex in the semantic component, we need to provide for it in Thai. Again, a meaning postulate will be able to handle the problem. This meaning postulate will state that something of the form (approximately) go(‘to’(x)) is logically equivalent to go(x). In going from Thai to English we would obtain the latter. Then, not finding a possible English phrase to express go(‘to’(x)), the system could refer to the meaning postulate, convert the expression into the form acceptable for English, and the results would be as desired.

Conclusion

Of course, not all the problems that machine translation would encounter have been discussed. However, I hope that some of the easy and the not so easy problems for a specific translation task have been pointed out, and solutions suggested. I believe that no difficulties presented here are insurmountable when natural extensions of the theoretical approach and modifications of the programs used are incorporated.

Footnotes

1. "LISP" is an acronym for List Processing Language and refers to a computer language used widely in the field of Artificial Intelligence.
2. Three native speakers of standard Thai were used as informants.
3. This statement is true only within a certain style of speech, casual-polite speech. If one speaks in a very formal manner, the number of relative pronouns increases. The casual-polite style is discussed here since it is the more common mode of expression in everyday Thai.
4. The translation of the is ignored for ease of exposition; whose is treated as a constant; and be-tall is taken as an intransitive verb phrase.
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